

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-17 and 21-25 remain in this application, where claims 1-3 and 18-20 had been previously canceled without prejudice; claims 8 and 11 have been currently canceled without prejudice, and claims 21-25 have been currently added. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications. Claims 4, 12 and 23 are independent.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to for failing show a corrugated topography of the third layer, as recited in claim 4. To obviate this drawing objection, claim 4 has amended to delete this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 12 and 15 for certain informalities. In response, claims 12 and 15 have been amended to remove the noted informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 12 and 15 has been overcome and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 4, 6-10, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0068389 (Green). Further, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,451,596 (Wilk). Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,786,988 (Harari). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0163722 (Gehring). Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087018 (Celinska).
Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-17 and 21-25, as amended, are patentable over Green, Wilk, Harari, Gehring and Celinska for at least the following reasons.

Green is directed to a flexible electronic device that

includes a rigid layer 2 which can be fractured along weakened regions 6 to afford flexibility. As correctly noted on page 6 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 11, Green does not disclose or suggest curved transitions. Harari is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Green.

Harari is directed to integrated circuit chips made bendable by forming indentations in their back surfaces. That is, the flexibility of normally brittle and breakable integrated circuit chips is increased by forming grooves, trenches, a series of holes, or the like, in a surface of the circuit chips that is opposite to the surface on which the integrated circuit is formed. As shown in FIG 9, a groove 123 is formed in the wafer 121, where the groove 123 is entirely curved with no flat surfaces.

It is respectfully submitted that Green, Harari, and combinations thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 23 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the second layer comprises a series of adjoining troughs and ridges, each trough and each

ridge including substantially flat portions, and wherein transitions between the troughs and ridges are curved.

Troughs and ridges that include substantially flat portions where the transitions between the troughs and ridges are curved are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Green and Harari, alone or in combination. At best, the combination Green and Harari discloses a wafer with rectangular and fully curved grooves. Wilk, Gehring and Celinska are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Green and Harari.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 4, 12 and 23 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully requested that claims 5-7, 9-10, 13-17, 21-22 and 24-25 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 4, 12 and 23 be allowed.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to

submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 31, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101